DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 702 EA 005 541

AUTHOR Masters, James R.
TITLE Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium: First Year Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Information Systems.
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Failure; Elementary Schools; *Humanization; Parochial Schools; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Schools Without Failure

ABSTRACT

The consortium was formed in the summer of 1971 as a means of implementing William Glasser's philosophy and methods. The program was implemented in two parochial elementary schools and in nine public elementary schools located in eight school districts. The evaluation discussed in this report included questionnaires to measure pupil self concepts and attitudes toward school. Also, since classroom meetings are a major part of the program, teachers were asked to fill in a Classroom Meeting Evaluation form after holding a meeting. In the analysis of pupil attitudinal data, it was found that, when data from all project districts were analyzed together, no significant differences were found between SWF school and control school pupils in either attitude toward school or self concept. It was also found that when SWF school and control school pupils were compared in their Spring 1972, responses to specific items, SWF school pupils held more positive attitudes than did control school pupils on items highly related to the objectives of the SWF program. The analysis of Classroom Meeting Evaluation forms revealed that, in general, teachers felt their meetings were effective. However, meetings held near the beginning and end of the school year were rated as more effective than were those held during the middle months of the year. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083702

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium: First Year Evaluation

EA 005 541

by James R. Masters
Educational Research Associate
Division of Research
Bureau of Information Systems
Pennsylvania Department of Education
April 1973

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Milton J. Shapp, Governor

Department of Education
John C. Pittenger, Secretary
David W. Hornbeck, Executive Deputy

Bureau of Information Systems
Seon H. Cho, Director

Division of Research
Robert B. Hayes, Director

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

Summary

The Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium was formed in the summer of 1971 as a means of implementing William Glasser's Schools Without Failure philosophy and methods. The program was implemented during the 1971-72 school year in two parochial elementary schools and nine public elementary schools located in eight school districts.

The consortium asked the Division of Research to help evaluate the first year of their project. This evaluation included questionnaires to measure pupil self concepts and attitudes toward school. Also, since classroom meetings are a major part of the program, teachers were asked to fill in a Classroom Meeting Evaluation Form after holding a meeting.

The analysis of Classroom Meeting Evaluation forms revealed that, in general, teachers felt their meetings were effective. However, meetings held near the beginning and end of the school year were rated as more effective than were those held during the middle months of the year. Fifth grade teachers felt their meetings were less effective than did teachers of pupils in other grade levels. Meetings planned in advance on topics selected by teachers were rated as more effective than were impromptu meetings and those in which pupils selected the topics for discussion. Both the number of meetings held per week and ratings of the effectiveness of meetings were found to vary across schools. An indication of the effectiveness of meetings was the finding that the percentage of pupils actively participating increased throughout the school year.

In the analysis of pupil attitudinal data it was found that, when data from all project districts were analyzed together, no significant differences were found between SWF school and control school pupils in either attitude toward school or self concept. However, in separate analyses performed for each school district, attitudinal differences between SWF school and control school pupils were found to vary across districts and, very often, for different grade levels within a district. Finally, when SWF school and control school pupils were compared in their spring, 1972 responses to specific items, it was found that SWF school pupils held more positive attitudes than did control school pupils on items highly related to the objectives of the SWF program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

SUMMARY iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

LIST OF TABLES. vi

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

The Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium. 1

First Year Evaluation of the Project. 2

II. CLASSROOM MEETING RESULTS 3

Instruments Used. 3

Description of Classroom Meetings Held. 3

Evaluation of Classroom Meetings. 8

Teacher Ratings of Effectiveness of Meetings and of Appropriateness of Topics Selected. 8

Per Cent of Class Members Actively Participating in Meetings. 13

Comparisons Across Schools. 18

III. ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS. 19

Instruments Used. 19

Evaluation Design and Statistical Analyses Used 20

Self Appraisal Inventory Analyses 22

School Sentiment Index Analyses 23

Analyses for Individual School Districts. 24

Analyses of Item Data 28

School Sentiment Index Analysis 29

Self Appraisal Inventory Analysis 40

APPENDICES. 49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Number and Per Cent of Each Type of Classroom Meeting Held	4
2	Mean Number of Meetings Per Month Held by Each Teacher.	5
3	Percentages of Planned and Impromptu Meetings.	6
4	Methods of Determining Meeting Topics.	6
5	Percentages of Meetings of Various Lengths	7
6	Teacher Ratings of the Effectiveness of Their Meetings	8
7	Teacher Ratings of the Appropriateness of Their Topics	9
8	Effectiveness of Planned and Impromptu Meetings.	9
9	Effectiveness of Meetings Held Each Month.	10
10	Effectiveness of Meetings Held with Each Grade Level.	11
11	Effectiveness of the Three Types of Meetings	12
12	Effectiveness of Meetings as a Function of Topic Selection Method	13
13	Percentage of Classroom Meetings in which Various Per Cents of Class Members Actively Participated	14
14	Percentage of Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Month of Year	15
15	Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Grade Level	16
16	Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Topic Selection Method.	17
17	Effectiveness of Meetings for Each School.	18
18	Reliabilities of the IOX Instruments	20
19	Self Appraisal Inventory Means	22
20	School Sentiment Index Means	23

TABLE		PAGE
21	Analyses of Pupil Attitude Data for Individual School Districts	25
22	Number of Pupils From Whom Spring, 1972 Item Data Were Obtained	29
23	Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Sizeable Differences Between SWF and Control Schools	32
24	Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Moderate Differences Between SWF and Control Schools	34
25	Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Minimal Differences Between SWF and Control Schools	37
26	School Sentiment Index: Number of Items of Each Subscale for Which Some Difference was Found in the Percentage of SWF School and Control School Pupils Giving Positive Responses	40
27	Intermediate Self Appraisal Inventory Items Showing Moderate Differences Between SWF and Control Schools	42
28	Intermediate Self Appraisal Inventory Items Showing Minimal Differences Between SWF and Control Schools	44
29	Self Appraisal Inventory: Number of Items of Each Subscale for Which Some Difference was Found in the Percentage of SWF School and Control School Pupils Giving Positive Responses	47

I. Introduction

A. The Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium

The Western Pennsylvania Schools Without Failure Consortium was formed during the summer before the 1971-72 school year as a means of implementing William Glasser's Schools Without Failure philosophy and methods (see Glasser, William; Schools Without Failure, 1969). The consortium consisted of two parochial elementary schools and nine public elementary schools located in eight school districts. The eight public school districts were Beaver, Ambridge, McKeesport, Mohawk, New Brighton, Blackhawk, Ellwood City and Farrell. The two parochial schools were Saints Peter and Paul in Beaver and Divine Redeemer in Ambridge.

The Schools Without Failure program stresses relevance, involvement and thinking. A major part of Dr. Glasser's philosophy is the belief that, although elementary school pupils may fail in many aspects of their day-to-day learning, no pupil should be labeled a failure.

The program is implemented through Dr. Glasser's Educator Training Center. At intervals of approximately five weeks a representative from ETC works with a selected "core group" of teachers, principals and other staff from schools using the program. After receiving training in Dr. Glasser's philosophy and methods, these core group members return to their respective schools to work with their own staffs in weekly seminar sessions.

A major feature of the program is the use of three types of nonjudgmental classroom meetings wherein all pupils can experience success. Open-ended meetings stimulate thinking about intellectually important subjects; educational-diagnostic meetings are to help each pupil understand the concepts of the curriculum, and social problem-solving meetings consider school problems of pupils. Teachers who have learned to use them successfully usually hold a meeting of one type or another each day.

Although the successful operation of class meetings is a major aspect of the SWF program, other success-oriented and child-centered policies are fostered as natural outgrowths of the new philosophy. Reconsideration of the grading and pupil progress assessment practices and adaptations of curricular materials to meet the specific intellectual, social and emotional needs of individual pupils are examples of such policies. Through the program each school works as a unit to solve its own problems. Thus, the program in operation is different in each school.

B. First Year Evaluation of the Project

The Division of Research of the Pennsylvania Department of Education was asked by the Western Pennsylvania Consortium to aid in the evaluation of their project. Since two objectives of the SWF program are to improve pupil attitudes toward themselves and to improve pupil attitudes toward school, questionnaires to measure attitudes in these areas were used. Also, since classroom meetings are a major part of the program, a means of evaluating them was used.

The following report, then, summarizes analyses performed by the Division of Research on first year data obtained from project schools.

II. Classroom Meeting Results

A. Instruments Used

At the beginning of the 1971-72 school year, the Division of Research suggested that the Classroom Meeting Evaluation Form, shown in Appendix A, be filled in by each teacher after he or she held a classroom meeting. At the end of the school year each project teacher was asked to select randomly two forms per month from those he or she filled in and to send these forms to the Division of Research for analysis. Also at the end of the school year each teacher was asked to fill in the Record of Classroom Meetings, shown in Appendix B.

Record of Classroom Meetings Forms were obtained from seven of the eight public school districts and from both parochial schools. Samples of Classroom Meeting Evaluation Forms were obtained from five of the eight public school districts and from both parochial schools. Since schools used the Classroom Meeting Evaluation Form in differing ways, it was not always possible to obtain two forms from each teacher for each month. However, all forms used in the following analyses were chosen randomly from those available and therefore should be representative of those filled in by all project teachers.

B. Description of Classroom Meetings Held

The Record of Classroom Meetings Form provided a means of compiling all classroom meetings held by teachers. Table 1 shows the number and per cent of each of the three types of meetings held in the nine schools where the form was filled in. As can be seen in the table, open-ended meetings were the predominant type held. Also, the per cent of each type of meeting held can be seen to have varied somewhat across schools.

Table 1

Number and Per Cent of Each Type of Classroom Meeting Held

School*	Number of Teachers	Open-Ended		Problem-Solving		Educational-Diagnostic		Total Number of Meetings
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
A	14	1645	95.1	6	0.4	78	4.5	1729
B	6	81	56.6	38	26.6	24	16.8	143
C	21	722	86.1	80	9.5	37	4.4	839
D	13	1548	89.6	123	7.1	57	3.3	1728
E	6	418	78.6	63	11.8	51	9.6	532
F	13	793	94.0	41	4.9	10	1.2	844
G	9	230	95.4	6	2.5	5	2.1	241
H	5	135	50.9	74	27.9	56	21.1	265
I	7	918	92.0	37	3.7	43	4.3	998
Totals	94	6490	88.7	468	6.4	361	4.9	7319

*Since the intent of this report is to describe results for the total project, districts will not be identified by name. However, throughout the report each district will maintain the letter designation used in Table 1. Although McKeesport implemented the program in two schools, data were collected from only one of the two. Thus, each letter designation stands for one school within a school district.

A second analysis of data from the Record of Classroom Meetings Form revealed that schools differed considerably in the number of meetings held by each teacher. Table 2 shows, for each school, the mean number of meetings held each month per teacher. Schools varied from a high of about four meetings per week to a low of about three meetings per month per teacher.

Table 2

Mean Number of Meetings Per Month Held by Each Teacher

School	Mean Number of Meetings Per Month Per Teacher*
A	14.2
B	2.7
C	4.5
D	14.8
E	10.2
F	7.2
G	3.2
H	6.8
I	15.8

*Adjusted for teachers who taught only part of the school year and for schools which did not hold meetings in September

The samples of Classroom Meeting Evaluation Forms, obtained from seven schools, also were used to provide a description of the use of meetings in the project. These forms were obtained from schools B, C, E, F, G, H and I. Data from a total of 1,152 forms were used in the following analyses. However, since all information called for in the form was not filled in on every form, the number of forms entering into most analyses is less than 1,152.

As a means of describing the use of classroom meetings in the project, the following three questions were answered from the data.

1. What per cent of the total number of meetings held were planned and what per cent were impromptu?

Table 3

Percentages of Planned and Impromptu Meetings

Planned		Impromptu	
Number of Meetings	Per Cent	Number of Meetings	Per Cent
750	67	375	33

As can be seen in Table 3, two-thirds of all meetings held were planned in advance by teachers.

2. How did teachers determine which topics to discuss in their meetings?

Table 4

Methods of Determining Meeting Topics

Method of Selecting Topic	Number of Meetings	Per Cent
Suggested by Pupils	301	27
Selected by Teacher	586	52
Suggested by the Events of the Day	205	18
Continuation from Another Meeting	36	3

For over one-half of all meetings held, teachers selected the discussion topic and prepared in advance for the meeting.

3. Of what length were meetings for each grade level?

Table 5

Percentages of Meetings of Various Lengths

Grade	Length of Meeting									
	3-10 min.	15 min.	20 min.	25 min.	30 min.	35 min.	40 min.	45 min.	50 min. or more	Total Number of Meetings
K	17*	46	29	6	2	0	0	0	0	65
1	12	52	28	7	0	1	0	0	0	83
2	1	14	33	24	22	3	3	0	0	125
3	1	21	29	25	16	3	2	1	2	124
4	1	24	24	14	25	4	4	2	1	206
5	0	13	26	37	12	5	5	1	0	281
6	4	11	25	25	16	9	6	3	2	234

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

The length of meetings differed for each grade level. In kindergarten and 1st grade most meetings lasted 15 to 20 minutes. In grades 2, 3, 4 and 5 most meetings lasted between 15 and 30 minutes, although a higher percentage of meetings longer than 30 minutes were held in grades 4 and 5 than in grades 2 and 3. Finally, in grade 6, although meetings of varying lengths were held, 20 per cent of meetings lasted longer than 30 minutes.

C. Evaluation of Classroom Meetings

Teacher Ratings of Effectiveness of Meetings and of Appropriateness of Topics Selected

The Classroom Meeting Evaluation Form included a section in which a teacher was asked to rate the effectiveness of each meeting and a section in which a teacher was asked to rate the appropriateness for his or her class of each topic discussed. Answers to the following seven questions were tabulated as a means of determining how teachers felt about their class meetings.

1. How effective did teachers feel their meetings were?

Table 6

Teacher Ratings of the Effectiveness of Their Meetings

Effectiveness Rating	Number of meetings	Per Cent
Excellent	311	27
Good	635	56
Not So Good	152	13
Poor	37	3

In general, teachers felt their meetings were effective. Eighty-three per cent of meetings were rated either Excellent or Good.

2. Did the topics selected for discussion turn out to be appropriate ones?

Table 7

Teacher Ratings of the Appropriateness of Their Topics

Appropriateness Rating	Number of Meetings	Per Cent
Excellent	425	41
Good	565	54
Not So Good	54	5
Poor	5	0

The overwhelming majority of topics discussed (95 per cent) were felt to have been appropriate ones.

3. Were planned or impromptu meetings more effective?

Table 8

Effectiveness of Planned and Impromptu Meetings

Type of Meeting	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
Planned	31*	60	8	1	747
Impromptu	21	48	24	7	367

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

As can be seen in Table 8, a higher percentage of planned meetings were rated Excellent or Good than were impromptu meetings.

4. Did the effectiveness of meetings increase as the year progressed?

Table 9

Effectiveness of Meetings Held Each Month

Month	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of Meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
September	31*	54	13	3	39
October	32	57	10	1	79
November	26	63	9	2	118
December	22	54	22	3	134
January	20	51	23	7	183
February	26	47	18	9	184
March	28	65	6	0	130
April	34	60	6	0	123
May	38	56	5	0	130

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

Table 9 indicates that teachers felt that their initial meetings went well, but that by December their effectiveness decreased. However, meetings were felt to be increasingly effective from December until the end of the year. In both April and May, 94 per cent of meetings were rated either Excellent or Good.

5. Did the effectiveness of meetings differ for each grade level?

Table 10

Effectiveness of Meetings Held with Each Grade Level

Grade	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of Meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
K	26*	65	8	2	66
1	17	76	5	2	84
2	22	71	5	2	125
3	34	58	8	0	126
4	27	65	8	0	206
5	21	38	30	11	282
6	39	51	10	0	233

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

The major result of interest in Table 10 is that shown for grade 5. Apparently 5th grade teachers encountered more difficulty with their classroom meetings than did teachers teaching any other grade level. Only 59 per cent of 5th grade meetings were rated either Excellent or Good whereas for each of the other six grade levels at least 90 per cent of meetings were rated either Excellent or Good.

6. Did the effectiveness of each of the three types of meetings differ?

Table 11

Effectiveness of the Three Types of Meetings

Type of Meeting	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of Meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
Open-Ended Problem-Solving	30*	60	9	1	752
Educational-Diagnostic	32	57	9	2	156
	26	58	14	3	120

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

As shown in Table 11, teacher ratings of effectiveness differed little for the three types of meetings.

7. Did the way in which topics were selected influence the effectiveness of meetings?

Table 12

Effectiveness of Meetings as a Function of Topic Selection Method

Means of Selecting Topics	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of Meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
Suggested by Pupils	23*	41	29	7	298
Selected by Teacher	27	62	8	2	584
Suggested by the Events of the Day	31	61	6	1	205
Continuation from Another Meeting	33	58	8	0	36

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

Meetings in which pupils selected the topics for discussion were rated lowest. Over 35 per cent of these meetings were rated either Not So Good or Poor.

Per Cent of Class Members Actively Participating in Meetings

Since a major purpose of classroom meetings is to increase involvement among pupils and teachers, a second means of assessing their effectiveness was to examine the per cent of class members actively participating. The following four questions were answered.

1. What per cent of class members actively participated in meetings?

Table 13

Percentage of Classroom Meetings in which Various Per Cents of Class Members Actively Participated

Per Cent of Class Actively Participating	Per Cent of Meetings	Total Number of Meetings
100	33	366
75	44	486
50	16	179
25	5	56
10	1	16

For 93 per cent of all meetings held, at least 50 per cent of class members actively participated.

2. Did the per cent of class members actively participating in meetings increase throughout the year?

Table 14

Percentage of Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Month of Year

Month	Per Cent of Class Actively Participating					Total Number of Meetings
	100	75	50	25	10	
September	33*	31	26	8	3	39
October	32	42	16	6	4	79
November	32	45	17	4	2	118
December	27	43	21	9	1	126
January	40	32	20	8	0	163
February	34	44	15	5	4	179
March	33	47	18	2	0	130
April	33	53	9	4	1	124
May	35	52	9	3	0	130

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

There was a decided trend toward greater class participation as the year progressed. In May, 87 per cent of meetings included at least 75 per cent of class members. In September, only 64 per cent of meetings included at least 75 per cent of class members. This is an indication that meetings were achieving their involvement purpose well by the end of the year.

3. Did the per cent of class members actively participating in meetings differ for each grade level?

Table 15

Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Grade Level

Grade	Per Cent of Class Actively Participating					Total Number of Meetings
	100	75	50	25	10	
K	33*	45	17	5	0	66
1	37	49	12	1	1	84
2	43	49	6	2	0	125
3	38	42	16	3	0	125
4	19	48	23	9	1	205
5	37	39	18	3	2	251
6	34	44	14	7	2	234

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

Although for each grade level at least 90 per cent of meetings included 50 per cent or more of class members, in 4th grade there was less participation than in each of the other grades.

4. Did the per cent of class members actively participating in meetings depend upon how topics were selected?

Table 16

Participation in Classroom Meetings as a Function of Topic Selection Method

Means of Selecting Topic	Per Cent of Class Actively Participating					Total Number of Meetings
	100	75	50	25	10	
Suggested by Students	35*	43	15	5	1	273
Selected by Teacher	34	44	17	6	1	576
Suggested by the Events of the Day	31	45	17	4	3	205
Continuation from Another Meeting	22	53	22	0	3	36

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

Although it might be expected that pupil selected topics would increase active pupil participation, this was apparently not the case. All ways of selecting topics were equally effective in eliciting pupil participation.

Comparisons Across Schools

A final means used to examine the effectiveness of classroom meetings was to compare meetings held in different schools. The question asked was, "Did the effectiveness of meetings differ across schools?"

Table 17

Effectiveness of Meetings for Each School

School	Effectiveness Rating				Total Number of Meetings
	Excellent	Good	Not So Good	Poor	
B	25*	41	21	7	107
C	28	56	14	2	400
E	25	68	7	0	76
F	26	65	7	1	229
G	26	59	15	0	78
H	36	55	9	0	254
I	D I D N O T R A T E M E E T I N G S				

*Numbers in body of table are percentages of meetings.

Teachers in all schools except B rated at least 80 per cent of their meetings Excellent or Good. By referring to Table 2, it can be seen that teachers in school B held fewer meetings per month than did teachers in any other school. By comparing the two tables it can be seen that, in general, the more meetings held per month by teachers in a school, the higher the meetings were rated. However, it cannot be determined from these data alone whether the increased use of meetings increased their effectiveness or whether lack of success in meetings caused teachers to hold fewer of them.

III. Attitude Questionnaire Results

A. Instruments Used

Because of a felt need in the educational community for affective measurement instruments, representatives from Title III programs in 18 states contracted with the Instructional Objectives Exchange of the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation to develop such measures. This development effort, begun in 1970, resulted in the publication of collections of instruments to measure attitudes toward school and self concepts of pupils ranging in grade level from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Instruments were selected from the IOX collections to determine whether, after one year of the program, attitudes of pupils in SWF schools differed from attitudes of pupils in schools not using the SWF program. The Self Appraisal Inventory was used to measure self concept and the School Sentiment Index was used to measure attitude toward school. The Primary Level instruments were used for grades K to 3 and the Intermediate Level instruments for grades 4 to 6.[1]

Since very little information about the measurement properties of these instruments was available, the Division of Research performed reliability studies using data from consortium school testings. As shown in Table 18, the internal consistency reliabilities were acceptable for instruments of this type.

---

[1]The Primary Level instruments are shown in Appendix C. The Intermediate Level instruments are included in a later section of this report.

Table 18

Reliabilities of the IOX Instruments

Instrument	Number of Items	Grade Level(s) of Pupils Tested	Number of Pupils Tested	Reliability*	Standard Error of Measurement
Self Appraisal: Primary	40	3	80	.85	2.72
Self Appraisal: Intermediate	80	4-6	1,845	.93	3.65
School Sentiment: Primary	30	3	80	.78	2.28
School Sentiment: Intermediate	75	4-6	1,318	.92	3.51

*Kuder-Richardson 20

B. Evaluation Design and Statistical Analyses Used

At the beginning of the 1971-72 school year the Division of Research suggested that each school district choose a control school, that is, a school not using the SWF program but similar to their SWF school in many ways. The Division of Research further suggested that the IOX instruments be administered both in the fall of 1971 and in the spring of 1972 to all pupils in both SWF schools and control schools. However, each school district was free to decide for itself how it would use the instruments.

Because school districts used the questionnaires in different ways, the analyses to follow were weakened somewhat. Two school districts did not obtain fall, 1971 scores for their pupils. These districts could not be included in the total project statistical analyses of data, since initial differences between their SWF school and control school pupils

could have accounted for whatever differences existed in their spring, 1972 scores. Two schools did not choose a control school. Since it was not possible to compare changes in their SWF school pupils with those of pupils from comparable schools, their scores were excluded from the total project analyses. Finally, two school districts did not use the School Sentiment Index and thus were included only in the Self Appraisal Inventory analyses.

Because no random assignment of pupils to experimental treatments was possible, class means were more appropriate as the unit of analysis than would have been scores of individual pupils. Therefore, instead of determining differences between fall and spring scores of individual pupils, the fall mean (average score) and the spring mean were computed for each class. These means entered into the analyses as scores.

Analysis of covariance was used in comparing the scores of SWF classes and control classes. In this statistical technique fall scores served as the covariate of spring scores. Through this procedure it was possible, when comparing spring means of SWF and control classes, to adjust these means to take into account fall differences which existed between the two groups. Adjusted spring means, therefore, were compared in the analyses.

In the analyses of covariance a 2 by 3 factorial design was employed. The two factors entering in were experimental treatment (SWF school vs. control school) and grade level (for Primary scores, grades 1 vs. 2 vs. 3; for Intermediate scores, grades 4 vs. 5 vs. 6). The use of a factorial design made it possible to determine not only whether differences in attitude existed between SWF and control classes, but also whether differences varied as a function of the grade level of pupils.

C. Self Appraisal Inventory Analyses

Table 19 shows the fall, 1971 and spring, 1972 means obtained by SWF and control classes on the Self Appraisal Inventories. Since in the analyses of covariance adjusted spring means were compared, these adjusted means are included in the table.

Table 19

Self Appraisal Inventory Means

	SWF Schools				Control Schools			
	Primary Grades							
Grade	Number of Classes	Fall, 1971 Mean	Spring, 1972 Mean	Adjusted Spring Mean	Number of Classes	Fall, 1971 Mean	Spring, 1972 Mean	Adjusted Spring Mean
1	7	26.00	26.22	25.93	5	25.41	27.36	27.53
2	10	26.48	28.53	27.87	6	26.07	25.31	24.98
3	6	24.58	25.71	26.53	5	24.40	25.02	25.98
	Intermediate Grades							
4	10	49.19	53.78	56.08	7	52.26	55.49	55.32
5	6	53.61	54.79	53.55	5	52.31	56.29	56.08
6	11	51.81	55.99	56.18	6	55.25	57.00	54.43

The analyses showed no significant differences between SWF and control groups or among grades on either inventory. (The analysis of covariance source tables are in Appendix D.)

D. School Sentiment Index Analyses

Table 20 shows the fall 1971 and spring 1972 means obtained by SWF and control classes on the School Sentiment Index. Also included are the adjusted spring means compared in the analyses of covariance.

Table 20

School Sentiment Index Means

	SWF Schools				Control Schools			
	Primary Grades							
Grade	Number of Classes	Fall, 1971 Mean	Spring, 1972 Mean	Adjusted Spring Mean	Number of Classes	Fall, 1971 Mean	Spring, 1972 Mean	Adjusted Spring Mean
1	4	19.53	21.90	22.66	3	19.29	22.20	23.12
2	7	21.96	23.83	23.09	4	21.82	21.89	21.24
3	3	19.36	18.36	19.23	3	21.11	22.21	22.00
	Intermediate Grades							
4	7	47.07	48.34	49.82	5	51.99	54.45	53.42
5	4	49.89	48.36	48.39	3	43.19	52.89	56.36
6	8	52.27	52.71	51.53	4	53.04	49.00	47.43

There were no significant differences between SWF and control schools in attitude toward school. Also, on neither the primary nor intermediate indices were the three grades significantly different. (The analysis of covariance source tables are in Appendix D.)

E. Analyses for Individual School Districts

In the attitude questionnaire analyses just described, data from individual school districts were grouped together. However, each school using the Schools Without Failure program may have done it in a different way. Thus, to see whether these schools had different results, separate analyses were performed on attitude questionnaire data from each district except B and H.

Table 21 summarizes the results of the individual school district analyses. For all districts but G, scores from a district's SWF school were compared with those of the district's control school. For district G no control school was available. For this district it was possible only to determine whether attitudes of SWF school pupils changed from fall to spring. When analysis of covariance was used for a school district analysis, differences found are described in Table 21 in terms of adjusted spring means. When, however, teachers did not ask pupils to write their names on their questionnaires, SWF school and control school pupils were compared on their fall scores and on their spring scores with analyses of variance. For these situations the results of both the fall and the spring analyses of variance are described in Table 21.

As can be seen in the table, not only did the results differ for each school district, but also, within a school district, the results very often differed for each grade level. It would appear, then, that the effects upon pupil attitudes of the SWF program depend on both school and teacher differences.

Table 21

Analyses of Pupil Attitude Data for
Individual School Districts

School District	Pupil Grade Level	Self Appraisal Inventory	School Sentiment Index
A	1-3	For grade 1, differences favoring control school pupils were found in both the fall and the spring; no conclusion could be drawn.	For grade 1, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring; no difference was found in the fall.
		For grade 2, a difference favoring SWF school pupils was found on adjusted spring means.	For grade 2, no difference was found on adjusted spring means.
		For grade 3, no difference was found in either the fall or the spring.	For grade 3, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring; no difference was found in the fall.
	4-6	For grade 4, no difference was found in either the fall or the spring.	For grade 4, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring; no difference was found in the fall.
		For grade 5, a difference favoring SWF school pupils was found on adjusted spring means.	For grade 5, no difference was found on adjusted spring means.
		For grade 6, a difference favoring SWF school pupils was found on adjusted spring means.	For grade 6, a difference favoring SWF school pupils was found on adjusted spring means.

School District	Pupil Grade Level	Self Appraisal Inventory	School Sentiment Index
C	1-3	For grade 2, a difference favoring SWF school pupils was found in the spring; no difference was found in the fall.	For grade 2, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in both the fall and the spring; no conclusion could be drawn.
	4-6	For grade 4, no difference was found in either the fall or the spring.	For grade 4, differences for one class favored SWF school pupils; differences for one class favored control school pupils; for a third class, no difference was found in either the fall or the spring.
		For grade 6, no differences were found in either the fall or the spring.	For grade 6, for two classes, no difference was found in either the fall or the spring; differences for one class favored SWF school pupils; for a fourth class, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in both the fall and the spring and no conclusion could be drawn.
D	1-3	Data not available for analysis.	Did not administer.
	4-6	For grades 4-6, no difference was found in the spring; fall data were not available for analysis.	Did not administer.

School District	Pupil Grade Level	Self Appraisal Inventory	School Sentiment Index
E	1-3	Data not available for analysis.	Data not available for analysis.
	4-6	For grades 4 and 6, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in the spring; for grade 5, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring. Fall data were not available for analysis.	For grades 4 and 6, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in the spring; for grade 5, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring. Fall data were not available for analysis.
F	1-3	For grades 1 and 3, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found on adjusted spring means; for grade 2, a difference favoring control school pupils was found on adjusted spring means.	Did not administer.
	4-6	For grades 4-6, no differences were found on adjusted spring means.	Did not administer.
G	1-3	For grades 2 and 3, no differences were found between fall and spring scores of SWF school pupils.	For grades 2 and 3, attitudes became less positive between the fall and the spring for SWF school pupils.
	4-6	For grades 4-6, attitudes became more positive between the fall and the spring for SWF school pupils.	For grades 4-6, no differences were found between fall and spring scores of SWF school pupils.

School District	Pupil Grade Level	Self Appraisal Inventory	School Sentiment Index
I	K-3	For K and grades 1 and 2, differences favoring control school pupils were found on adjusted spring means; for grade 3, no difference was found on adjusted spring means.	For K and grade 1, differences favoring control school pupils were found on adjusted spring means; for grades 2 and 3, no differences were found on adjusted spring means.
	4-6	For grades 4-6, differences favoring control school pupils were found on adjusted spring means.	For grades 4 and 5, differences favoring control school pupils were found on adjusted spring means; for grade 6, no difference was found on adjusted spring means.
J	1-3	Data not available for analysis.	Data not available for analysis.
	4-6	For grades 4 and 5, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in the spring; for grade 6, no difference was found in the spring. Fall data were not available for analysis.	For grades 4 and 5, differences favoring SWF school pupils were found in the spring; for grade 6, a difference favoring control school pupils was found in the spring. Fall data were not available for analysis.

F. Analyses of Item Data

In all analyses described thus far total scores on questionnaires were used. Because it was felt that these total scores might be obscuring actual differences between SWF and control school pupils, analyses of responses to specific items were undertaken.

In the spring of 1972 the Division of Research provided machine scorable answer sheets to all Western Pennsylvania Consortium districts which requested them and then scored the Intermediate questionnaires for these districts. The analyses to follow include data from districts A, C, D, E, F, G, H and J. Districts B and I were excluded because they scored their own questionnaires. Table 22 shows the number of pupils from whom the item data were obtained.

Table 22

Number of Pupils From Whom Spring, 1972
Item Data Were Obtained

	Self Appraisal Inventory		School Sentiment Index	
Grade	SWF Schools	Control Schools	SWF Schools	Control Schools
4	393	195	293	116
5	371	211	305	114
6	433	212	348	142
Totals	1,197	618	946	372

Since no item data were gathered in the fall of 1971, the analyses to follow should be viewed as probable indications of the effects of the SWF program. However, it is possible that differences between SWF and control school pupil attitudes existed before the SWF program was started.

School Sentiment Index Analysis

The Intermediate School Sentiment Index consists of 75 items. The following five subscales are included in the instrument:

1. Teachers, i.e., one's subjective feelings about teacher behavior (rather than an objective report on that behavior) with respect to

   a. Mode of Instruction (T_M): 13 items

   b. Authority and Control (T_A): 13 items

   c. Interpersonal Relationship of Teacher to Pupils (T_I): 13 items

2. Learning (L), i.e., one's attitude toward the learning experience, independent of attitude toward school, teachers and subjects, as reflected in intellectual curiosity, willingness to study, voluntarism, interest in problem-solving, etc.: 6 items

3. School Social Structure and Climate (S), i.e., one's attitude toward his school as a social center, a rule-making and rule-enforcing entity and an extracurricular opportunity system: 16 items

4. Peer (P), i.e., one's feelings regarding the structure of, and climate of relationships within the peer group, rather than particular individuals within that group: 10 items

5. General (G), i.e., one's general orientation toward schooling, independent of a particular school: 9 items

The items of the Index consist of statements to which pupils respond "True" if an item describes them or "Untrue" if an item does not describe them. In scoring the instrument a pupil receives one point for each "True" response to a positively stated item (e.g., I try to do my best in school) and one point for each "False" response to a negatively stated item (e.g., This school is like a jail).

To examine differences between SWF school and control school pupils in their responses to specific items, answer sheets first were grouped by grade level (4,5,6) and by type of school (SWF and Control). For each of the six groups, the percentage of pupils giving a positive response was computed for each item. Depending on the amount of difference between SWF and control pupils, items were separated into three types:

1. Items for which rather sizeable differences existed between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. For these items, shown in Table 23, differences of at least 10 per cent occurred in at least two grade levels.

2. Items for which some difference, but not a great deal of difference, existed between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. For these items, shown in Table 24, differences of between 5 per cent and 9 per cent occurred in at least two grade levels.

3. Items for which either minimal differences or differences in only one grade level existed between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. These items, shown in Table 25, comprise the remainder of the questionnaire.

Table 23

Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Sizeable Differences Between SWF and Control Schools

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
My teacher always tells me when she is pleased with my work.	T_M	72*	61	75	55	61	62	SWF
In school I have to remember too many facts.	T_M	61	47	66	45	69	54	SWF
I get tired of hearing my teacher talk all the time.	T_M	58	54	60	47	51	38	SWF
My teacher grades me fairly.	T_M	88	78	87	81	87	72	SWF
We change from one subject to another too often in class.	T_M	70	66	76	70	81	67	SWF
My teacher unfairly punishes the whole class.	T_A	58	48	66	54	59	37	SWF
I feel like my teacher doesn't like me when I do something wrong.	T_A	53	39	53	48	53	27	SWF
When I do something wrong, my teacher corrects me without hurting my feelings.	T_A	80	75	77	67	60	31	SWF
I know what my teacher expects of me.	T_A	80	70	81	78	84	72	SWF
My teacher does not scare the children.	T_A	73	69	71	60	65	36	SWF
My teacher is interested in the things I do outside of school.	T_I	42	32	47	26	39	37	SWF

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
My teacher likes some children better than others.	T_I	49	43	50	35	45	27	SWF
I often feel rushed and nervous in school.	S	60	49	65	53	71	70	SWF
There are many different activities at school from which I can choose what I would like to do.	S	57	46	55	38	40	21	SWF
When I do something wrong at school, I know I will get a second chance.	S	62	46	60	34	53	39	SWF
When I have a problem on the playground at recess, I know I can find a nice teacher to help me.	S	80	64	73	67	65	39	SWF
There is no privacy at school.	S	43	33	52	39	40	35	SWF
At school other people really care about me.	S	58	43	59	54	55	37	SWF
I would rather eat lunch at home than at school.	S	41	41	46	31	48	31	SWF

*Numbers in the table are percentages of pupils giving positive responses.

Table 24

Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Moderate Differences Between SWF and Control Schools

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
My teacher gives me work that is too hard.	T_M	87*	77	90	84	90	91	SWF
My teacher seldom tells me whether my work is good or bad.	T_M	41	46	59	39	59	53	SWF
My teacher is often too busy to help me when I need help.	T_M	68	68	77	69	81	72	SWF
My teacher usually explains things too slowly.	T_M	71	83	72	76	76	85	Control
In our class we often get a chance to make decisions together.	T_A	81	73	82	73	83	73	SWF
I get as many chances as other children to do special jobs in my class.	T_A	66	73	74	68	64	49	SWF
My teacher treats me fairly.	T_A	85	78	86	81	81	65	SWF
My teacher scares me.	T_A	82	83	85	73	84	76	SWF
My teacher is mean.	T_A	83	75	84	82	85	75	SWF
My teacher bosses the children around.	T_A	73	68	77	68	75	57	SWF
The children in my class nearly always obey the teacher.	T_A	66	56	66	61	55	61	SWF

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
My teacher listens to what I have to say.	T_I	83	81	83	75	81	58	SWF
My teacher doesn't understand me.	T_I	75	78	78	69	78	65	SWF
I wish my class could have this teacher next year.	T_I	67	56	63	57	55	52	SWF
I like my teacher.	T_I	86	80	86	89	83	73	SWF
I feel unhappy if I don't learn something new in school each day.	L	34	28	35	30	23	23	SWF
I would rather get books for my birthday than toys or clothes.	L	30	25	27	29	20	11	SWF
This school is like a jail.	S	66	54	73	68	69	61	SWF
The principal of the school is friendly toward the children.	S	86	90	85	96	80	89	Control
The principal's main job is to punish children.	S	74	81	84	84	86	92	Control
I get scared when I have to go to the office at school.	S	43	48	57	44	61	54	SWF
There are too many children in my class.	S	80	89	86	82	78	87	Control
Other children bother me when I am trying to do my schoolwork.	P	43	36	55	47	57	45	SWF
Other children often get me into trouble at school.	P	61	52	70	63	68	71	SWF

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
I think a new child could make friends easily in my class.	P	84	72	87	91	78	73	SWF
When a new child comes into our class, my friends and I try very hard to make him or her feel happy.	P	90	84	85	89	80	73	SWF
It is hard for me to stay happy at school.	G	69	64	72	68	80	75	SWF
School gives me a stomachache.	G	73	65	77	73	80	73	SWF
I feel good when I am at school.	G	55	39	57	48	60	52	SWF
I like school better than my friends do.	G	51	44	48	39	43	35	SWF

*Numbers in the table are percentages of pupils giving positive responses.

Table 25

Intermediate School Sentiment Index Items Showing Minimal Differences Between SWF and Control Schools

Item	Subscale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con
My teacher gives me work that is too easy.	T_M	75*	77	81	85	88	79
My teacher tries to make school interesting to me.	T_M	85	84	85	80	77	74
My teacher does not give me enough time to finish my work.	T_M	74	72	77	65	80	80
My teacher makes sure I always understand what she wants me to do.	T_M	87	91	86	82	77	61
I am afraid to tell my teacher when I don't understand something.	T_A	68	66	69	68	67	61
My teacher does not care about me.	T_I	85	78	89	85	86	82
My teacher is not very friendly with the children.	T_I	83	81	84	81	87	80
I like to do school work at home in the evenings.	L	23	21	21	23	19	14
I would rather learn a new game than play one I already know.	L	73	74	73	74	63	65
I like trying to work difficult puzzles.	L	74	71	75	78	70	68
The biggest reason I come to school is to learn.	L	90	92	90	85	77	80
I follow the rules at school.	S	89	81	85	89	77	82
I am embarrassed to be in the class I'm in.	S	87	84	86	86	93	92

Item	Subscale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con
I have to share books with other children too often at school.	S	89	88	89	91	94	95
I often feel lost at school.	S	77	72	80	77	82	87
I often must do what my friends want me to do.	P	51	55	56	57	61	65
The other children in my class are not friendly toward me.	P	79	75	87	87	85	85
I really like working with the other children in my class.	P	87	85	88	87	89	87
School is a good place for making friends.	P	85	86	87	85	88	91
I don't like most of the children in my class.	P	83	65	84	83	87	88
Older children often boss my friends and me around at my school.	P	36	36	47	44	73	77
Each morning I look forward to coming to school.	G	55	54	54	46	49	51
I try to do my best in school.	G	97	93	94	91	88	86
I often get headaches at school.	G	59	57	66	58	64	71
I like to stay home from school.	G	47	46	55	53	58	50
I want to be a very good student.	G	96	93	96	97	94	94

*Numbers in the table are percentages of pupils giving positive responses.

As shown in Table 23, for certain items there were rather large differences between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. For all of these items a higher percentage of SWF school pupils gave positive responses than did control school pupils. In examining these items it is evident that many are highly related to the objectives of the SWF program and the differences found are ones which would be expected to occur if the program were achieving its objectives.

A higher percentage of SWF school pupils than control school pupils felt that their teachers and others in the school cared about them, even when they did something wrong. Also, a higher percentage of SWF school pupils than control school pupils held more positive attitudes toward their grading system and toward the amount of fact-memory learning required of them. The differences found on the items of Table 23 were most striking for pupils in grade 6; for many of these items, only about one-third of control school pupils gave positive responses.

Of the 30 items shown in Table 24, items for which some difference but not a great deal of difference existed between SWF schools and control schools, a higher percentage of SWF school pupils gave positive responses to 26 items.

In Table 26 the results shown in Tables 23 to 25 are tabulated. As is evident in this table, SWF school and control school pupils differed most on the teacher subscale. For 26 of these 34 items, SWF school pupils had more positive attitudes than did control school pupils.

Mixed results were found for the School Social Structure subscale. Although SWF school pupils had more positive attitudes than did control school pupils for nine of these items, control school pupils had more positive attitudes for three of the items.

Table 26

School Sentiment Index
Number of Items of Each Subscale for Which Some Difference was Found in the Percentage of SWF School and Control School Pupils Giving Positive Responses

Subscale	Items for Which SWF School Pupils Were More Positive	Items for Which Control School Pupils Were More Positive	Items for Which No Differences Were Found	Total Number of Items
T_M	8	1	4	13
T_A	12	0	1	13
T_I	6	0	2	8
L	2	0	4	6
S	9	3	4	16
P	4	0	6	10
G	4	0	5	9

Self Appraisal Inventory Analysis

The Intermediate Self Appraisal Inventory consists of 80 items. The following four subscales are included in the instrument:

1. Peer (P), i.e., one's view of self in relations with peers: 20 items.
2. Family (F), i.e., one's view of self in the family context: 20 items.
3. School (S), i.e., one's view of self in school situations, involving school work, teacher, etc: 20 items.

4. General (G), i.e., one's general perception of self: 20 items.

For the Self Appraisal Inventory analysis of item responses, procedures similar to those followed for the School Sentiment Index were used. However, since differences between SWF school and control school pupil responses were not great, items were grouped in only two ways:

1. Items for which some difference existed between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. For these items, shown in Table 27, differences of at least 5 per cent occurred in at least two grade levels.
2. Items for which either minimal differences or differences in only one grade level existed between SWF schools and control schools in the percentage of pupils giving positive responses. These items, shown in Table 28, comprise the remainder of the questionnaire.

Table 27

Intermediate Self Appraisal Inventory Items Showing Moderate Differences Between SWF and Control Schools

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
I am always friendly toward other people.	P	68*	73	69	75	71	75	Control
Friends usually follow my ideas.	P	55	44	57	51	55	56	SWF
I would rather be with kids younger than me.	P	83	82	84	91	89	94	Control
I often get in trouble at home.	F	61	55	65	55	68	58	SWF
There are times when I would like to leave home.	F	37	27	33	34	34	28	SWF
My family respects my ideas.	F	74	58	73	64	72	54	SWF
I behave badly at home.	F	86	78	82	87	89	75	SWF
I feel that my family always trusts me.	F	75	64	73	64	67	58	SWF
My family would help me in any kind of trouble.	F	90	84	90	83	86	83	SWF
My family understands me.	F	84	81	84	79	84	73	SWF
My family often expects too much of me.	F	72	65	76	71	75	63	SWF
I am an important person to my family.	F	81	74	83	74	83	72	SWF
My family usually considers my feelings.	F	80	71	82	78	80	69	SWF
I forget most of what I learn.	S	74	65	75	70	77	67	SWF

Item	Sub-scale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Group Giving the Higher Percentage of Positive Responses
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con	
I often get discouraged in school.	S	51	46	56	53	61	54	SWF
My teacher makes me feel I am not good enough.	S	71	64	71	64	73	64	SWF
I can give a good report in front of the class.	S	53	45	56	52	56	47	SWF
I am proud of my school-work.	S	74	67	74	66	70	60	SWF
I am a good reader.	S	64	65	65	59	70	64	SWF
I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	S	48	44	43	28	45	31	SWF
I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	S	48	43	52	57	55	45	SWF
I am good in my school-work.	S	70	71	70	63	75	65	SWF
My classmates think I am a good student.	S	61	53	64	54	64	62	SWF
I am popular with kids my own age.	G	71	64	68	63	64	75	SWF
I often do things that I'm sorry for later.	G	28	34	27	25	31	36	Control
If I have something to say, I usually say it.	G	67	57	67	52	67	67	SWF
I am sure of myself.	G	74	68	70	68	74	66	SWF

*Numbers in the table are percentages of pupils giving positive responses.

Table 28

Intermediate Self Appraisal Inventory Items Showing Minimal Differences Between SWF and Control Schools

Item	Subscale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con
I like to meet new people.	P	97*	96	96	99	97	99
I wish I got along better with other children.	P	28	35	39	36	47	36
Other children are often mean to me.	P	68	61	70	68	76	76
Most children have fewer friends than I do	P	45	48	46	42	37	47
I am easy to like.	P	67	71	76	72	81	80
I am popular with girls.	P	63	58	63	64	66	67
I am lonely very often.	P	63	63	72	73	74	84
Older kids do not like me.	P	66	68	78	79	85	85
Most people are much better liked than I am.	P	42	45	52	52	52	54
I am popular with boys.	P	62	60	66	67	61	69
I don't have many friends.	P	75	72	77	80	85	85
I am among the last to be chosen for teams.	P	60	55	64	62	59	58
It is hard for me to make friends.	P	75	72	76	80	79	86
I wish I had more close friends.	P	25	33	40	39	40	38
Sometimes I am hard to be friendly with.	P	43	51	49	51	48	44
I am fun to be with.	P	79	71	78	82	81	82
Often I don't like to be with other children.	P	72	66	69	75	74	75

Item	Subscale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con
I can disagree with my family.	F	63	59	73	69	79	75
I do my share of work at home.	F	88	85	84	86	84	82
No one pays much attention to me at home.	F	84	80	88	86	90	83
My family is glad when I do things with them.	F	94	90	91	93	95	89
I usually treat my family as well as I should.	F	84	84	80	80	74	73
I cause trouble to my family.	F	83	82	87	86	89	80
I know what is expected of me at home.	F	87	83	85	82	92	87
I sometimes argue with my family.	F	66	67	74	68	71	79
I get upset easily at home.	F	56	52	59	61	59	58
My family and I have a lot of fun together.	F	90	88	89	91	87	82
Schoolwork is fairly easy for me.	S	67	62	70	68	76	77
I usually like my teachers.	S	92	86	86	91	86	82
I often feel upset in school.	S	63	61	65	65	74	71
I can always get good grades if I want to.	S	81	75	82	81	85	88
I often volunteer in school.	S	78	73	77	75	73	71
I am a good student.	S	77	79	79	71	79	79
I am slow in finishing my schoolwork.	S	75	77	75	74	77	75
I like to be called on in class.	S	76	70	74	73	64	63
I would like to drop out of school.	S	79	63	75	84	84	83

Item	Subscale	Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
		SWF	Con	SWF	Con	SWF	Con
I can disagree with my teacher.	S	54	55	65	54	65	62
I am satisfied to be just what I am.	G	87	87	82	81	80	89
I am a cheerful person.	G	81	73	78	81	82	86
I often let other kids have their way.	G	25	27	28	31	27	34
I can always be trusted.	G	64	67	63	69	68	68
I am a happy person.	G	81	81	84	82	86	89
I wish I were younger.	G	86	84	85	85	86	91
I always like being the way I am.	G	67	64	58	56	61	56
I am often unhappy.	G	69	60	68	72	76	79
I am not as nice looking as most people.	G	53	53	56	58	51	60
I don't worry much.	G	50	49	52	48	48	45
I have a lot of self control.	G	69	58	60	70	65	65
I often feel ashamed of myself.	G	67	64	64	62	70	64
I am a good person.	G	83	82	80	83	86	81
I wish I were a different person.	G	79	75	77	77	79	79
I can always take care of myself.	G	70	75	71	71	75	69
I can't be depended on.	G	78	76	87	91	86	88

*Numbers in the table are percentages of pupils giving positive responses.

Table 29 is a compilation of the results shown in Tables 27 and 28. As shown in the table, almost all differences found between SWF school and control school pupils were on the Family and School subscales. As would be expected if the SWF program were achieving its objectives, a higher percentage of SWF school pupils than control school pupils felt that they were succeeding in school. The fact that a higher percentage of SWF school pupils than control school pupils gave positive responses to items of the Family subscale could be attributed to the SWF program; if SWF school pupils felt good about themselves in the school situation, it is possible that these good feelings could carry over to their relations at home. However, it is also possible that these differences existed before the SWF program was implemented in the Western Pennsylvania Consortium schools.

Table 29

Self Appraisal Inventory
Number of Items of Each Subscale for Which Some Difference was Found in the Percentage of SWF School and Control School Pupils Giving Positive Responses

Subscale	Items for Which SWF School Pupils Were More Positive	Items for Which Control School Pupils Were More Positive	Items for Which No Differences Were Found	Total Number of Items
P	1	2	17	20
F	10	0	10	20
S	10	0	10	20
G	2	1	17	20

Appendix A

SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE CLASSROOM MEETING
EVALUATION FORM

TEACHER_____ SCHOOL_____

GRADE LEVEL_____ DATE_____

1. Type of meeting:

( ) Problem Solving ( ) Open Ended ( ) Educational Diagnostic

2. Topic of meeting:_____

_____

3. The meeting was: ( ) Planned ( ) Impromptu

4. How did you arrive at the topic of the meeting?

( ) Suggested by student(s)
( ) Selected by teacher
( ) Was suggested by events of the day
( ) Continuation from another meeting

5. The approximate length of the meeting (in minutes) was:

( ) 3	( ) 15	( ) 30	( ) 45
( ) 5	( ) 20	( ) 35	( ) 50
( ) 10	( ) 25	( ) 40	( ) over 50

6. The per cent of class members actively participating was approximately:

( ) 10 ( ) 25 ( ) 50 ( ) 75 ( ) 100

7. How would you rate the meeting in terms of its effectiveness in fulfilling the Schools Without Failure objectives for this type of meeting?

( ) Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Not so good ( ) Poor

8. How would you rate the topic in terms of its appropriateness for your class?

( ) Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Not so good ( ) Poor

9. Remarks:_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE

RECORD OF CLASSROOM MEETINGS

TEACHER_____ SCHOOL_____

GRADE LEVEL_____

The number of classroom meetings I held during each month of the 1971-72 school year was:

	Open-Ended	Problem-Solving	Educational Diagnostic
September			
October			
November			
December			
January			
February			
March			
April			
May			

Appendix C

SELF APPRAISAL INVENTORY

Primary Level

1. Are you easy to like?
2. Do you often get in trouble at home?
3. Can you give a good talk in front of your class?
4. Do you wish you were younger?
5. Do you usually let other children have their way?
6. Are you an important person to your family?
7. Do you often feel bad in school?
8. Do you like being just what you are?
9. Do you have enough friends?
10. Does your family want too much of you?
11. Are you a good reader?
12. Do you wish you were a different child?
13. Are other children often mean to you?
14. Do you tell your family when you are mad at them?
15. Do you often want to give up in school?
16. Can you wait your turn easily?
17. Do your friends usually do what you say?
18. Are there times when you would like to run away from home?
19. Are you good in your school work?
20. Do you often break your promises?
21. Do most children have fewer friends than you?
22. Are you a good child?
23. Are most children better liked than you?

24. Would you like to stay home instead of going to school?

25. Are you one of the last to be chosen for games?

26. Are the things you do at school very easy for you?

27. Do you like being you?

28. Can you get good grades if you want to?

29. Do you forget most of what you learn?

30. Do you feel lonely very often?

31. If you have something to say, do you usually say it?

32. Do you get upset easily at home?

33. Do you often feel ashamed of yourself?

34. Do you like the teacher to ask you questions in front of the other children?

35. Do the other children in the class think you are a good worker?

36. Does being with other children bother you?

37. Are you hard to be friends with?

38. Would you rather play with friends who are younger than you?

39. Do you find it hard to talk to your class?

40. Are most children able to finish their school work more quickly than you?

Appendix C (Cont'd)

SCHOOL SENTIMENT INDEX

Primary Level

1. Is your teacher interested in the things you do at home?
2. When you are trying to do your schoolwork, do the other children bother you?
3. Does your teacher give you work that is too hard?
4. Do you like to tell stories in front of your class?
5. Do other children get you into trouble at school?
6. Is school a happly place for you to be?
7. Do you often get sick at school?
8. Does your teacher give you enough time to finish your work?
9. Is your school principal friendly toward the children?
10. Do you like to read in school?
11. When you don't understand something, are you afraid to ask your teacher a question?
12. Are the other children in your class friendly toward you?
13. Are you scared to go to the office at school?
14. Do you like to paint pictures at school?
15. Do you like to stay home from school?
16. Do you like to write stories in school?
17. Do you like school better than your friends do?
18. Does your teacher help you with your work when you need help?
19. Do you like arithmetic problems at school?
20. Do you wish you were in a different class at school?
21. Do you like to learn about science?
22. Do you like to sing songs with your class?
23. Does your school have too many rules?
24. Do you always have to do what the other children want to do?

25. Do you like the other children in your class?

26. Are you always in a hurry to get to school?

27. Does your teacher like some children better than others?

28. Do other people at school really care about you?

29. Does your teacher yell at the children too much?

30. Do you like to come to school every day?

Appendix D

Analysis of Covariance for the Primary
Self Appraisal Inventory

Source	SS'	MS'	df	F
Treatment (SWF vs. Control)	3.48	3.48	1	0.24
Grade (1 vs. 2 vs. 3)	1.33	0.67	2	0.05
Treatment x Grade	33.38	16.69	2	1.19
Within	448.31	14.01	32	
Total	486.50		37	

Analysis of Covariance for the Intermediate
Self Appraisal Inventory

Source	SS'	MS'	df	F
Treatment (SWF vs. Control)	0.00	0.00	1	0.00
Grade (4 vs. 5 vs. 6)	4.88	2.44	2	0.24
Treatment x Grade	28.88	14.44	2	1.41
Within	389.75	10.26	38	
Total	423.51		43	

Analysis of Covariance for the Primary
School Sentiment Index

Source	SS'	MS'	df	F
Treatment (SWF vs. Control)	1.13	1.13	1	0.13
Grade (1 vs. 2 vs. 3)	17.14	8.57	2	1.01
Treatment x Grade	19.89	9.95	2	1.17
Within	144.05	8.47	17	
Total	182.21		22	

Appendix D (Cont'd)

Analysis of Covariance for the Intermediate School Sentiment Index

Source	SS'	MS'	df	F
Treatment (SWF vs. Control)	42.63	42.63	1	1.68
Grade (4 vs. 5 vs. 6)	31.13	15.56	2	0.61
Treatment x Grade	161.63	80.81	2	3.18
Within	609.50	25.40	24	
Total	844.89		29	